



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

admirable exposition of modern pedagogy which he takes out of the other compartment of his mental storehouse. The American literature of boys' clubs, juvenile courts, social settlements, and probation commissions is generously cited in proof of the positive and constructive suggestions which abound in the verifiable propositions of the volume.

C. R. HENDERSON

Enzyklopädisches Handbuch des Kinderschutzes und der Jugendfürsorge. Von DR. PHIL. TH. HELLER, DR. JUR. FR. SCHILLER, DR. MED. M. TAUBE. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann, 1911. 2 vols.

These two volumes offer substantial articles on the legislation of all the principal countries relating to the care and protection of children and youth. The materials are furnished by competent men in each nation and are brought down to a recent date. With this general survey all the subjects of greatest interest in this field are adequately treated by noted specialists, and a select bibliography is furnished with each article.

C. R. HENDERSON

The Transition to an Objective Standard of Social Control. By LUTHER LEE BERNARD. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. iii+96.

This publication is marked by a wealth of allusions to the literature of the field, by determined and ambitious search for advance beyond the position hitherto reached upon a fundamental and difficult theme, and by a number of evidences of insight. It has the common trait of doctoral theses, a somewhat turgid technicality of style.

It offers a protest against the "subjectivistic" character of sociology, as manifested in two ways: First, it is manifested in the attempt to explain social facts by reference to so-called "social forces," the feelings, motives, or interests that are supposed to direct the conscious activities of men. Second, it is manifested in the idea that attainment of individual satisfactions made democratically prevalent is the standard by which to measure the desirability of social conduct and by which to guide social control.

The protest against the first of these two manifestations of sociological subjectivism, namely the attempt to explain social facts by mere

reference to conscious motives, is thoroughly justified. With reference to this, however, the author practically confines himself to protest, and does not set forth the more scientific method of sociological explanation.

The second protest does not seem to be so well justified; and the constructive attempt to supply an "objective standard," which is the real aim of the thesis, is not convincingly successful.

It is true that consciousness (motives, interests) includes only a fraction of the elements in the *causation* of social facts, but does it not include all of the ultimate *results* that can be regarded as values, or standards of conduct? The immense range of qualities of satisfaction that may be included in the concept of a satisfying life, and their variability, as men through social molding acquire their "second natures," do not prevent a person or a society from having, at a given time, a standard of value, a personal and social ideal, which for that person or society is a real standard for individual effort and for social control. Such standards are open to comparison, criticism, and experimental tests, and subject to progress. And they are apparently the only kind of standard conceivable, except a theological or metaphysical law which is, after all, nothing but an apotheosis of speculative absolutizing of such a personal or social ideal.

Dr. Bernard's proposal is that the "objective" standard shall be a social order, to which all individualistic satisfactions, "though democratic," must be subordinated. But what kind of a social order, the existing one? Then no prophets should invite stones, nor Christ dare the cross. Shall it not be the one that will most promote the democratic individual satisfactions, as experimentally determined? Can a social order be made the ultimate standard and measure, must not the social order itself be measured by a standard composed of elements of value to be realized in human consciousness? The thesis of Dr. Bernard is that "social organization or the group, is the social object of primary importance (p. 92) while the individual is secondary, constitutive, and contributory." "Democratic conservation," not "democratic gratification" must be the standard. "The counterplea of 'interference with individual liberty' should have no weight in court, for individuals have no liberties in opposition to a scientifically controlled society."

He is right in proposing a philosophy of loyalty, but it must be loyalty to social aims that are composed of individual values.

EDWARD C. HAYES